Case 1:18-cr-00759-JSR Document 58 Filed 06/11/19 Page 1 of 24

J5T6MOOC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 18 CR 759 (RMB) V. 5 JAMES MOORE and SAVRAJ GATA-AURA, 6 7 Defendants. Conference 8 New York, N.Y. 9 May 29, 2019 11:00 a.m. 10 11 Before: 12 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 BY: MARTIN BELL VLADISLAV VAINBERG 18 Assistant United States Attorney 19 DAVID M. GARVIN, PA Attorneys for Defendant Moore 20 BY: DAVID M. GARVIN 21 RANDY ZELIN, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Gata-Aura 22 23 Also Present: Special Agent Jordan Anderson, FBI Nathaniel Cooney, Paralegal 24 25

(Case called) 1 2 THE COURT: Please be seated. 3 I think somebody had made an arraignment for Mr. Moore to appear by phone or video today. It hasn't happened as far 4 5 as we're aware. 6 The question to defense is: Is it okay to waive 7 Mr. Moore's appearance or do you want to wait? 8 MR. GARVIN: Yes, your Honor. I spoke with Mr. Moore 9 with the understanding that there was a possibility that might 10 occur. He made it clear to me that if it did occur, he would 11 like us to go forward. 12 THE COURT: It's not uncommon I should tell you. 13 Sometimes it works when these video hookups are attempted and 14 unfortunately sometimes it doesn't. 15 First of all, I think the government may have the most information about this, about whether or not Mr. Moore will be 16 17 here and when he will be here. Our trial is scheduled for 18 Monday. 19 Do you think he will make it, Mr. Bell? 20 MR. BELL: The short answer, your Honor, is yes. 21 Candidly he should have been here now and it is our 22 understanding he was on our way to a plane and there was a 23 paperwork snafu --

There was a glitch.

THE COURT: A glitch.

MR. BELL: -- in Florida.

24

The folks in Florida have informed us that he is due to fly up specifically on Friday. We will look to confirm that once again today. He should be here on Monday. They are mindful of the fact that the trial begins on Monday and he should be here.

I will note that to the extent he is not here today, there had been an understanding before that it might be difficult to get him on a plane to actually get him here for the pretrial conference. Likewise, because ordinarily at least at the Florida office of the Bureau of Prisons, it takes about five days' notice to provide for staffing in order for him to be in a facility where he can call into the conference, and we learned that he wasn't going to be here promptly pretty far in advance into that window. He should be here on Monday because he is due to be on a plane certain on Friday.

THE COURT: Counsel, does that square with what your understand is?

MR. GARVIN: The first half of it with the snafu, yes, your Honor. The second half the staff has been noncommittal with Mr. Moore. They told him that they are doing his best, but that was as far as they needed to give him an answer.

THE COURT: As far as I know, Mr. Bell's recitation is correct. You never know until you know in this business.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GARVIN: We intend to be here Monday morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you need to see him before then and 1 if so, you will be in touch with Mr. Bell to know where he is. 2 3 MR. GARVIN: Your Honor, the answer to your question 4 is yes. THE COURT: You may need to be in touch with the 5 6 marshals. 7 MR. GARVIN: Yes. That is one issue I did want to 8 Perhaps now would be the appropriate time. 9 that I wanted to furnish Mr. Moore civilian clothes so that he 10 can be brought up before the jury is placed in the stand and 11 then when the jury leaves, he will be taken out of civilian 12 clothes. 13 THE COURT: Right. 14 MR. GARVIN: I didn't know if the person to contact 15 would be the marshals or who would be the person. 16 THE COURT: Normally it is. Mr. Bell can help you out 17 in that regard. It is a common practice. I have seen 18 occasions where counsel bring the clothes actually to the 19 courtroom the same day and the prisoner is able to change in 20 the cell. 21 MR. GARVIN: We're fine with that, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I don't know if you will get to see him 23 before then, but for sure that will happen.

MR. BELL: I have seen that too, your Honor.

happy to reach out to the criminal desk at the Marshal's

24

office, because sometimes policies change, and to connect Mr. Garvin with the appropriate person there as well.

THE COURT: Great.

I put out an order on May 23rd raising some questions about the trial and then a subsequent trial with Mr. Gata-Aura and wanted to hear if any defense counsel had any concerns about prejudice or if that is what they both want to do, proceed Monday with Mr. Moore and at a some subsequent time with Mr. Gata-Aura. So we'll start with Mr. Moore since it's closest in time to your client's trial.

MR. GARVIN: Yes, your Honor. Respectfully Mr. Moore wishes to proceed on Monday morning.

THE COURT: You needn't say more unless you want to.

Do I have counsel here for Mr. Gata-Aura?

MR. ZELIN: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. ZELIN: Randy Zelin, Z-e-l-i-n, for Mr. Gata-Aura, who is to my left and your Honor's left.

If your Honor please, my client was arraigned on the superseding indictment this past Thursday, May 23rd. At this juncture, I believe consistent with the colloquy I had with the Court and the government at the time of my client's arraignment, I expect to meet and confer with the government in the not too distant future to discuss both, I guess for lack of a better way of putting it, some open-file discovery or

discovery prior to the actual formal filing of Rule 16 demands.

I would respectfully submit, your Honor, that at this moment it would be premature for me to posit as far as a trial, a trial schedule, trial readiness and things of that nature.

THE COURT: But it certainly is not Monday?

MR. ZELIN: We will not be able to proceed on Monday, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have no objection with our proceeding with Mr. Moore on Monday; is that a fair statement?

MR. ZELIN: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: We're still missing names, places, entities for the voir dire. We usually have it by now. We need it to pick a jury.

MR. VAINBERG: Your Honor, I believe we intended to submit that.

THE COURT: When I say names and places. Names we usually like to show an address. Not a street address necessarily, but if the person lives in the Bronx or Staten Island or whatever and/or an occupation so the jury doesn't say, Well, I know a Mr. Bell, but it is not the same Mr. Bell that we're talking about.

MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor. I believe we had filed a joint list along with our proposed voir dire; but if it didn't make it on the docket, we'll submit it to the Court today.

1 THE COURT: Hold on. 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: No, Judge. 3 THE COURT: We didn't get it. Christian said we 4 didn't get it. 5 MR. VAINBERG: We'll file it. 6 THE COURT: It has the information that I am looking 7 for? MR. VAINBERG: I believe it contains the names of the 8 9 witnesses, but not additional information that the Court has 10 requested. So we'll include information about their 11 occupations. 12 THE COURT: For the witnesses to be sure their 13 occupations and any places that will be discussed at trial. 14 MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: And any other names that are going to be mentioned apart from names of the witnesses, for example. 16 17 may talk about Mr. Zelin or something like that and so we would 18 have to know who Mr. Zelin is for the jury. MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Can we have that by, say, 3:00 today? 21 MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Great. 23 I think then that leaves us with some open motions. 24 With respect to motions in limine, I am deciding them as

follows and not necessarily in this order, but there is a

motion to admit Mr. Moore's involvement in forming and promoting Our Space, which is a competitor to Bar Works.

By the way these things would have to be on your list, these names, if they aren't already and what are they so to speak.

During and after the charged conspiracy -- this is the easy motion because the defense says that Mr. Moore does not object to the admission of this evidence to complete the story as to what Mr. Moore did when he left Bar Works. So that motion is granted on consent.

This is a government motion. I think they are all government motions actually. There is a motion to admit the existence of publications and press releases on the Internet before and through the period of the charged conspiracy, which referred to or discussed Mr. Haddow's adverse regulatory history and his real name. Here, the defense requests that the Court limit this evidence to the testimony of Mr. Haddow and any articles Mr. Moore may have made reference to in emails to Mr. Haddow.

The defense does not challenge Haddow's statement that he created the name Jonathan Black in part because there were negative articles about him on the Internet during the period 2014 through 2016.

So this motion is granted in part and denied in part as follows: I will limit the evidence that may be admitted in

J5T6MOOC

Internet information of Haddow to such testimony and documents that would include emails and articles mentioned by Mr. Moore if he were to take the stand for example, and if he weren't as he might reflect in other evidence that is going to be admitted perhaps by an email for example or emails to Mr. Haddow and/or others involved in the alleged scheme. The admission of other negative Internet materials and articles regarding Mr. Haddow will be denied.

MR. BELL: Judge, may we be heard on that one briefly?

THE COURT: Very briefly.

MR. BELL: Judge, we don't --

THE COURT: So we're not allowing the Internet world into this case because it has bad comments about one person or another. We're not doing that unless it is limited to as I said and in the fashion I said. You cannot come in with a whole bunch of Internet information by people we have no idea who they are or articles that are not directly referenced by either the defendant or Mr. Haddow.

MR. BELL: So that is something your Honor --

THE COURT: -- and/or emails.

That is the ruling.

MR. BELL: We understand that, your Honor. Let me give you a little bit of color as to --

THE COURT: I don't need color. I need to know what

you are trying to admit that is not included in that ruling.

MR. BELL: What we were looking to admit, your Honor, is approximately four or five I would say either releases from British regulatory authorities or coverage of Mr. Haddow's past activities that fits in with that negative history.

THE COURT: So that would be excluded under my ruling. If you want to discuss it with defense counsel and see if he agrees, that might be one way to get it in.

MR. BELL: The problem here, Judge, is that as I understand your Honor's ruling, any of those items, their admissibility would be tethered to some documented sense that Mr. --

THE COURT: Frankly I don't understand what you are talking about -- tethered to. Talk to defense counsel and see if you can work it out. He may have no objection in which case I would not either. Otherwise, I do. If there is a press release by the U.K. securities and exchange commission about him, no.

MR. BELL: Just so that I understand this so we might be able to work around this in our discussions with Mr. Garvin, is your Honor's concern that there would be a prejudice to Mr. Moore who is not mentioned in those materials?

THE COURT: I am concerned about the most obvious example of hearsay and I am not going to let it in.

MR. BELL: Would it be possible, Judge, to blunt

against that with a limiting instruction that the parties or 1 2 that the government could propose that essentially --3 THE COURT: You can propose it separately. First, you 4 should talk to defense counsel and see if what you are seeking 5 to admit is okay with him. 6 MR. BELL: I understand that, Judge. 7 THE COURT: Secondarily, you will send me a letter if 8 you fail in that. I think you will not fail. But if you fail 9 in that connection, you can make a separate proposal this 10 afternoon. 11 MR. BELL: I understand that, your Honor. speak to Mr. Garvin about that and put something in. 12 13 THE COURT: How do you know? 14 MR. BELL: Only because he made the motion, Judge. THE COURT: He made the motion to exclude? 15 16 Well, rather because he opposed our motion. 17 THE COURT: I thought they were all your motions. 18 MR. BELL: Correct. I am sorry there, Judge. Only 19 because Mr. Moore's counsel had essentially opposed. 20 THE COURT: So, yes. We got it. You will talk to 21 If it works out, it will work out. If it doesn't, he 22 will make a suggestion. I am pretty comfortable with the 23 ruling I have made so far. 24 MR. BELL: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: There is another motion by the government

to admit Moore's prior business relationships with Renwick
Haddow, who is the founder of Bar Works, and the coconspirator
in the charged conspiracy, who allegedly with Moore's
assistance misled investors about the identity and control of
Bar Works. The defense says that Mr. Moore denies that he ever
worked at Rooms to Invest.

Incidentally, that would be another item on your list for the jury, Rooms to Invest.

Mr. Moore further denies that he ever worked on any project with Haddow or was associated with prior to Bar Works in late 2015. This is the defense speaking, Mr. Moore did not locate agents for Rooms to Invest. He owned a parcel of property in Barbados that he offered to Haddow for his Rooms to Invest concept. Haddow declined the offer.

So the motion in this sense is granted. The Court will allow such testimony as background to show the prior relationship the parties had prior to the Bar Works alleged fraudulent scheme. The government will in the process need to advise the jury that it is not alleging that Rooms to Invest was a fraud or an unlawful scheme.

I am sure you are okay with that; right?
MR. VAINBERG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So two more. There is a motion also from the government to admit Mr. Moore's conviction for misprision of felony in connection with the unlawful disbursement to Moore

of escrow deposit funds from approximately 1,750 clients of IAP intended for a Florida real estate condominium project.

The defense says that Mr. Moore's conviction regarding an isolated conversation that occurred approximately 10 years ago with Paul Oxley -- another name you should have on your list -- does not have any probative value whatsoever on this issue. It is patently irrelevant and will only confuse the jury.

This motion by the government is granted. The defendant's prior conviction based upon a fraudulent real estate investment scheme is relevant in this case and the Court will permit its introduction through defendant's plea agreement and plea allocution. This conviction arises out of Moore's role in Inside Track and Instant Access Properties and the introduction of Mr. Moore's experience with Inside Track and Instant Access Properties is admissible to prove knowledge, intent, and absence of mistake. Assuming as I do that the defense claim is that the defendant had no intent to defraud and that he along with the investors was himself duped.

A cite that you might rely on is *United States v.*Alcantara, 674 F. App'x. (2d Cir. 2006) and *United States v.*Francisco, 35 F.3d 116 (4th Cir. 1994).

The last motion is from the government motion to admit Mr. Moore's involvement in founding and operating the British Property Investment Company's Inside Track seminars and Instant

Access Properties, which sold educational seminars and marketed real estate property purportedly vetted by IAP to investors.

The defense opposes the introduction of this evidence of Inside Track seminars and Instant Access Properties. The defense argues that Renwick Haddow was never involved in those businesses and those businesses failed in approximately 2008 due to the real estate crash of that year.

This motion is granted as follows: The Court will allow the introduction of Mr. Moore's experience with Inside Track and Instant Access Properties as 404(b) evidence to prove knowledge, intent and absence of mistake. In reaching this conclusion to introduce such evidence, I have relied on Federal Rule of Evidence 403 along with the Second Circuit's inclusionary approach to other act evidence under Rule 404(b), which does allow evidence to be admitted for any purpose other than to demonstrate criminal propensity.

Those are the rulings. I don't know that there is any other issues that we have for today.

MR. BELL: Just a couple, Judge.

First, just so that we understand one of the rulings that your Honor made, to the extent that Mr. Haddow testifies that he is familiar or that he was at the time familiar with the particular release or article about his doings in Great Britain, would that fall within your Honor's ruling as in the same way that it would for Mr. Moore?

THE COURT: What do you think? You heard the ruling.

MR. BELL: I did. But insofar --

THE COURT: What do you conclude?

MR. BELL: I would conclude yes because Mr. Moore and Mr. Haddow were coconspirators and Count One charges a conspiracy.

THE COURT: I don't want to get into specific evidence in or out. I thought the rulings were pretty clear. You can talk again to defense counsel and see if he thinks it is in or out. If you have a difference of opinion, when you get the transcript and see what the ruling is, then I will give you an answer.

MR. BELL: Understood.

Another issue, Judge, is this is something where we have conferred and reached an agreement but just wanted to make your Honor aware of it. One of the things that the government has to demonstrate is that essentially the substance of the misrepresentation alleged here that Jonathan Black was the person who was running Bar Works as opposed to Mr. Haddow is in fact material. We intend to call a number of victim witnesses and among the questions that we would ask them in order to prove up this element is whether it would have mattered that someone with and then we would outline Mr. Haddow's regulatory history was running Bar works. If they had known that, would it have affected the way in which they approached the

investment.

Ordinarily I think that is a relatively uncontroversial point. The order of witnesses is such that we may wind up asking witnesses that question before the factual predicate relating to Haddow's actual history is on the line.

THE COURT: It is better to do that the other way.

MR. BELL: Because it is a short trial, there are constraints with witness availability. My understanding is that Mr. Garvin is all right with it. So I wanted to note that for your Honor.

MR. GARVIN: Your Honor, yes, the defense is all right with that. No, the defense will not be taking a position during this trial that that would not be material. In plain words, materiality of that misrepresentation is not going to be an issue in this trial.

THE COURT: Got it. Good.

Oh, my.

MR. BELL: Sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: This is not going to happen during the trial; is it?

MR. BELL: We're clearing a whole bunch of issues out so we don't have to deal with them later on, Judge.

Am I right in understanding your trial day is a 9:30 start?

the cp: 9:15.

MR. BELL: And we go to 5:00.

THE COURT: 4:45.

MR. BELL: Given that, Judge --

THE COURT: Usually we take a short lunch break and I will ask the jury some time around 11:00 and maybe again at 3:00 if anybody needs it a bath room break.

MR. BELL: Given that, Judge, just to give your Honor a sense of time, we have --

THE COURT: If you don't have a witness when the witness who is on the stand is finished, then the trial is over.

MR. BELL: We'll be mindful of that, Judge.

Our belief is that we should rest some time early
Thursday. That's the way that things project at this point.

It may be that in order to both work around a scheduling
constraint or two with the witness and to use the jury's time
in the best way possible, there may be a point towards the back
end where we ask to take a witness out of order just so that we
can get them in and out and use the time well.

THE COURT: As a practical matter if you could finish it by Wednesday that will be better. I don't know if it will work or not, but it would be much better to have that whole day Thursday to devote summation and jury instruction.

MR. BELL: Judge, we have one witness who we're trying to deal with now who is not going to be available Wednesday,

but that witness would be even if he is a holdover, a relatively short witness at the beginning of Thursday.

THE COURT: Is he or she a must witness, or is it cumulative of what somebody else is going to say?

MR. BELL: The witness does provide some facts that no other witness does, but we may make a determination depending on where we are and how things have come through.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BELL: We want to get this done as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: I know that. I know how juries react. If we have that time, you might be able to finish get a verdict on the same day.

MR. BELL: Understood.

THE COURT: It takes however long it takes.

MR. BELL: The schedule is a little bit of an interesting creature because there is one witness and Mr. Haddow who we think will take the most time on direct and through Mr. Garvin's estimate on cross. There are a number of witnesses before that who will move very, very quickly. So we are doing the best we can to work within those constraints.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELL: Mindful of that too and because the trial is going to be so short, it may make sense for us to talk about a charge conference timeline now.

THE COURT: No. We'll talk about that when we talk about it. We'll see where we are. But as soon as you finish, I will be ready for a charge conference. I will distribute to you a draft some time before then enough for you to look through it.

MR. BELL: Understood.

There may be, Judge, supplemental requests to charge that we have just based on things that come up within the trial. We don't anticipate them. We think we did a pretty thorough job within what the parties jointly submitted to the Court. But if they do come up, we'll get them in promptly.

THE COURT: I suppose from what you are saying, you wouldn't need the three days, right, for testimony, the full three days? Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

MR. BELL: We are assuming, Judge, that it may take until lunch on Monday to pick a jury. We don't anticipate much longer than that because it is a short trial.

THE COURT: If we get the jury pool up here.

MR. BELL: If they are up here promptly. Because it is only a week, we anticipate that there will not be a lot of hardship cases. Assuming for to the moment that we start, say, at 2:00 or so on Monday afternoon as tends to happen in this courthouse in my experience and we have opening statements, we will get in a witness or two on Monday and then we'll have two full days — Tuesday, Wednesday and a little bit of Thursday —

after which the government would rest. So it would effectively be a little bit shy of three days.

THE COURT: I get it. Obviously it takes us what it takes. I will be here and we're not going to rush the jurors or the defense or the government.

MR. BELL: We have Special Agent Jordan Anderson our case agent here. This may or may not come up. It frequently doesn't. We usually stipulate these things away to the extent necessary. But to the extent that there are departures, deviations between what is in the 302s and what other witnesses testify to, Mr. Garvin has asked to call Mr. Anderson as a witness on some of those scores. If he does in fact want to call him, we want to make sure that the Court is okay with Mr. Anderson actually being here as the case agent through the trial. I don't think there is a sequestration issue, but I note that now so we don't run headlong into it later.

MR. GARVIN: There is no problem from the defense.

THE COURT: It is common practice.

MR. BELL: Is your Honor's jury selection method sort of the standard struck panel type? Would we look for only one alternate, perhaps two in light of the relatively short duration of the trial?

THE COURT: Let's leave that until Monday. I am not sure. I want to look over the submissions, etc. I am not sure how many alternates we're going to have.

1 MR. BELL: One moment, please. 2 (Pause) 3 Judge, I think that is all we had save for MR. BELL: 4 one matter. 5 THE COURT: Is there anything that I have talked about 6 or that you all know about that I don't know about that can be 7 stipulated instead of a witness for example? MR. BELL: We're working on a number of stipulations 8 9 There are any number of custodians we'll happily not have 10 to call. 11 THE COURT: That is not what I am talking about. for sure should be a stipulation. I mean substantive if the 12 13 witness were called, the witness would say the following. 14 MR. BELL: There will be a handful of those as well 15 and we'll discuss it more with Mr. Garvin once we're done here.

MR. BELL: There will be a handful of those as well and we'll discuss it more with Mr. Garvin once we're done here. I think that as it is, Judge, we're looking at a trial that is going to consist of fewer than 10 witnesses and only one of those is going to be of any real length. We're already I think in a pretty streamlined place.

THE COURT: I am not necessarily thinking of streamlining. I am thinking if there is no disagreement between the parties, then why not.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BELL: Understood. As I understand Mr. Garvin's principal defense, which is essentially that Jonathan Black was not real but that his client did not know about that, there are

some things we can work around there. 1 2 THE COURT: You talk to him and see. 3 MR. BELL: The only other issue, Judge, is were Mr. Moore here, we would look to have him allocuted on prior plea 4 5 offers pursuant to the Supreme Court decisions in Lafler and 6 Frve. 7 THE COURT: I am not sure. You are more attune than I I don't know what he needs to be allocuted. 8 9 MR. BELL: Ordinarily, Judge, what we would do prior 10 to the start of the trial is we would --11 THE COURT: That might be the perfect thing for us to 12 stipulate to. 13 MR. BELL: That we cannot stipulate to, Judge. 14 THE COURT: What do you have to ask? What we would allocute Mr. Moore to is 15 MR. BELL: whether has received a formal plea offer prior to this. 16 17 would make a representation with respect to that. What I was 18 merely going to suggest, Judge, is because Mr. Moore is not 19 here now that we do that while we're waiting for the jury pool 20 to come up on Monday. 21 THE COURT: Is that okay with you, Mr. Garvin? 22 MR. GARVIN: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: That works for me. 24 MR. BELL: I meant to say Monday, Judge, if I did not.

THE COURT: So if you could break out the lists in two

separate pages, one for names and addresses of people and the other for locations, business entities on another list.

MR. GARVIN: Your Honor, may I be heard for one moment?

THE COURT: Sure.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GARVIN: I apologize. I know the Court was clear but I still have a question.

THE COURT: Frequently that happens.

MR. GARVIN: On the prior conviction for a misprision on a felony arising from the Lake Austin Real Estate deal in Orlando, Florida, the Court made reference that it was rolling, that the government's motion was granted as to I think I heard the Court say the plea colloquy and allocution, but I am not certain. I apologize.

THE COURT: I said plea agreement and plea allocution.

MR. GARVIN: Okay.

THE COURT: You may want to get a copy of the transcript and go through it and see if there is anything you want. I think that is it then.

Nice to see you.

MR. ZELIN: Your Honor, one quick note with regard to my client, Mr. Gata-Aura. Your Honor will recall as a condition of the -- two conditions of the bail package that was worked out with the government and so ordered by your Honor this past Thursday, one condition was that my client post

\$5,000 in cash or \$5,000 of collateral. We do have a bank check made payable to the clerk, which we'll bring down to the Clerk's Office.

The other condition, which is that two additional cosigners sign off on the bond, I have advised the government that my client's wife and mother-in-law are both present in the courtroom and I will bring them to the clerk to cosign the bond.

THE COURT: Nice to see you all.

We're adjourned.

11 000